

REMARKS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The Office has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C § 112 second paragraph as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. This rejection is traversed and overcome after entry of the included amendments to the Claims. Claims 1-29 have been amended to include testing steps and Applicant respectfully requests that the Office remove the 35 U.S.C § 112 rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

The Office has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they disclose a claimed invention that is an abstract idea as defined in the case *In re Warmderdam*. Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include language further describing testing processes and steps. Applicant believes that independent claim 12 contained the requisite language to disclose a testing process, however, claim 12 has been amended to further clarify the testing process and steps. Additionally, independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to include language clarifying that they are "computer implemented" methods. After entry of the included amendments, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

The Office has rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,058,857 to Dallin (hereinafter "Dallin"). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason.

Dallin fails to teach all elements of Applicant's claimed invention. Dallin teaches using a single computer to generate a test script file using a type template and an output template with data stored in a table. The Office asserts that the teachings of Dallin found in

Column 4, Lines 40-45 are analogous to Applicant's claimed "registering the first location with the same server component system". However, the cited portion of Dallin fails to teach using more than one computer. The cited portion of Dallin teaches the process system using a type template, an output template, and a table having test data to generate a test script file. Note that the cited portions of Dallin are limited to actions occurring on one computer as shown in Figure 1. Applicant's claimed invention is different than what is taught in Dallin as Applicant's claim a main server component and at least two client component systems. If the Office wishes to maintain the rejection based on Dallin, Applicant respectfully requests and explanation regarding how the one computer taught by Dallin can be used as Applicant's claimed main server component system and at least two client component systems.

Applicant also asserts that the teachings of Dallin found in Column 11, Lines 20-46 are not analogous to the respective portions of Applicant's claimed invention as asserted by the Office. While Dallin mentions that the automation tool could exist outside of the computer and communicate with the computer system via a network, as shown in Figure 5 of Dallin, the automation tool is a component of the memory of a single computer system 110. Even assuming accessing the automation tool via a network can be analogous to Applicant's second client system, Dallin fails to teach the first client system and main server component as argued above. As Dallin fails to teach all aspects of Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Dallin.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

The Office rejected claims 6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dallin taken with U.S. Patent No. 6,993,748 to Schaefer. As argued above, Dallin fails to teach all elements of Applicant's claimed invention. The Office relies on Schaefer to teach a dynamically generated Java class, a configuration file and a property file. Schaefer remains

silent regarding a main server component system and at least two client component systems and thus fails to cure the previously discussed deficiencies of Dallin. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Dallin and Schaefer.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6903. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP340). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Konrad K. Chan, Esq.
Reg. No. 57,857

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No: 25920